arXiv:1401.1053v2 [cs.LO] 22 Apr 2014

Terminal semantics for codata types in intensional Martin-Löf type theory

Benedikt Ahrens and Régis Spadotti

Institut de Recherche en Informatique de Toulouse
Université Paul Sabatier, Toulouse

Abstract. In this work, we study the notions of *relative comonad* and *comodule over a relative comonad*, and use these notions to give a terminal coalgebra semantics for the coinductive type families of streams and of infinite triangular matrices, respectively, in intensional Martin-Löf type theory. Our results are mechanized in the proof assistant `Coq`.

1 Introduction

In this work, we study the notions of *relative comonad* and *comodule over a relative comonad*. We then use these notions to characterize several *co*inductive data types in intensional Martin-Löf type theory via a universal property.

In a set-theoretic setting, inductive sets are characterized as initial algebras for some endofunctor on the category of sets. For instance, the set of natural numbers constitutes the carrier of the initial algebra of the functor $X \mapsto 1 + X$.

In a type-theoretic setting as given by Martin-Löf type theory [19], two approaches to the semantics of inductive types have been studied: one approach consists in showing that inductive types exist in a *model* of the type theory, as is done by [21]. Another approach is to prove that adding certain type-theoretic rules to the type theory implies (or is equivalent to) the existence of a universal object *within* type theory (see, e.g., [9,13]). This latter approach is the one we take in the present work.

Some attention has to be given to the precise formulation of the type theory in question: One important feature of Martin-Löf type theory is the *identity type*, a type family that associates to any two inhabitants $a, b : A$ of a same type A the type of "identities" between them. One distinguishes *extensional* and *intensional* type theory, according to whether terms of identity type are reflected into the internal, judgmental equality of the type theory or not. This difference must be considered when defining the notion of "initial algebra", in particular the *uniqueness* part of initiality:

In extensional type theory, propositional equality as given by the Martin-Löf identity type [19] is reflected into judgmental equality via a *reflection rule*. This reflection rule equips *extensional* type theory with extensional features similar to those of set theory. As a consequence, the characterization of a W-type—a member of a particular class of inductive types—in extensional MLTT as initial algebra for some endofunctor on the category of types [13] works as in the category

of sets. Indeed, in extensional MLTT, one has function extensionality available, which suffices to deduce that there is a *judgmentally unique* algebra morphism from the initial algebra to any algebra.

Intensional Martin-Löf type theory [19] lacks this reflection principle for the sake of decidability of type checking. It forms the base of two computer proof assistants, `Coq` and `Agda`. W-types have been studied [9] in *Homotopy Type Theory* (HoTT) [24], an extension of intensional Martin-Löf type theory. In this extension, function extensionality is provable from the *Univalence Axiom*. For a suitable definition of *uniqueness—contractibility* in HoTT jargon—one can then prove uniqueness of the algebra morphisms out of the one whose carrier is given by the W-type. The mentioned work [9] thus shows that the characterization of W-types as initial algebras carries over from extensional to intensional type theory if one adds an extensionality principle for functions and adapts the notion of uniqueness.

The characterization of inductive sets/types as initial objects in some category has been extended to some *heterogeneous*—also called *nested*—inductive data types, e.g., the type of λ-terms, in different formulations [14,16]. The main goal of these works is not just to characterize a data type via a universal property, but rather a data type *equipped with a canonical, well-behaved substitution operation*.

Dually to inductive sets, **co**inductive sets such as streams are characterized as terminal objects [18]. Inhabitants of such sets are equal if and only if they are *bisimilar* [23]: Intuitively, two elements of a coinductive set are the same if they allow for the same observations.

This correspondence between equality and bisimilarity fails in IMLTT, when equality is considered to be given by the Martin-Löf identity type. Instead, one defines *bisimilarity* as a coinductive predicate on a coinductive type, and one reasons about the terms of a coinductive type modulo the bisimilarity predicate rather than identity [12]. Consequently, we consider two maps into a coinductive type to be the same if they are *pointwise bisimilar*—an analogue to the aforementioned principle of function extensionality. With these conventions, we give, in the present work, a characterization of some coinductive data types as *terminal* objects in some category defined in intensional Martin-Löf type theory. More precisely, we consider an example of *homogeneous* codata type, streams, and an example of *heterogeneous* codata type, triangular matrices. For each of these examples we prove, from type-theoretic rules specifying the respective codata type added to the basic rules of Martin-Löf type theory, the existence of a terminal object in some category *within IMLTT*. Our terminal semantics characterizes not only the codata types themselves but also the bisimilarity relation and a canonical cosubstitution operation on them.

The fact that cosubstitution for coinductive data types is comonadic in a set-theoretic setting is established by [25]. In IMLTT however, in order to characterize that cosubstitution operation on a given codata type, and its algebraic properties, we develop the notion of *relative comonad* and *comodule over a relative comonad*. The need to consider *relative* comonads arises from the need to check the algebraic

properties of cosubstitution modulo *bisimilarity* rather than modulo identity (in the sense of ML identity types).

All our results have been implemented in the proof assistant `Coq` [11]. The `Coq` source files and HTML documentation are available online [6]. In this document, we hence omit the proofs and focus on definitions and statements of lemmas.

Disclaimer The category-theoretic concepts studied in this work are agnostic to the foundational system being worked in. While we present them in a type-theoretic style, the definitions and lemmas can trivially be transferred to a set-theoretic setting. Throughout this article, we use type-theoretic notation, writing $t : T$ to indicate that t is of type T. For instance, we write $f : \mathcal{C}(A, B)$ to indicate that f is a morphism from object A to object B in category $\mathcal{C}$. Whenever an operation takes several arguments, we write some of them as indices; these indices might be omitted when they can be deduced from the type of the later arguments. We assume basic knowledge of category theory; any instances used are defined in the following.

More related work The notion of *module over a monad*, which we dualize and generalize in this work, is used by [16] to give an initial semantics result for languages with variable binding. Their work is based on work of [8], who show that the lambda calculus equipped with a simultaneous substitution constitutes a monad. We make use of the notion of *relative comonad*, the dual to relative monads as introduced by [7]. One of our main examples, the codata type of infinite triangular matrices, is studied by [20]. Redecoration for both finite and infinite triangular matrices is used by [1] to exemplify the expressivity of the studied recursion schemes.

Organisation of the paper In Section 2 we introduce some concepts and notations used later on. In Section 3 we present the coinductive type families Stream of streams and Tri of infinite triangular matrices and some operations on those codata types. Their specifying rules are given in Appendix A and Appendix B, respectively. In Section 4 we present *relative comonads* and define the category of comonads relative to a fixed functor. We give some examples of such structures, using the codata types presented in Section 3. In Section 5 we define comodules over relative comonads and give some constructions of comodules. Again, examples of such structures are taken from Section 3. In Section 6 we define categories of coalgebras for the codata types presented in Section 3, based on the category-theoretic notions developed in the previous sections. We then prove that the codata types constitute the terminal coalgebras in the respective categories. Finally, we present an example of a map defined as a terminal map exploiting the universal property of streams. In Section 7 we explain some details of the formalization of this work in the proof assistant `Coq`. A table with the correspondence between formal and informal definitions is given in Appendix C.

2 Preliminaries

In this section we present some particular categories and functors used later on, and fix some notation.

Definition 1 (Some categories). *We denote by* Type *the category of types (of a fixed universe) and total functions between them in Martin-Löf type theory. A morphism* f *in this category is denoted by* $f : A \to B$.

We denote by Setoid *the category an object of which is a* setoid*, i.e. a type equipped with an equivalence relation. A morphism between setoids is a type-theoretic function between the underlying types that is compatible in the obvious sense with the equivalence relations of the source and target setoids. If* A *is a setoid, we also use* A *to refer to its underlying type, and thus write* $a : A$ *for an element* a *of the type underlying the setoid* A*. We write* $a \sim a'$ *for related elements* a *and* a' *in* A*. We consider two parallel morphisms of setoids* $f, g : A \to B$ *equal if for any* $a : A$ *we have* $fa \sim ga$.

We also write $f : A \to B$ *for a morphism* f *between objects* A *and* B *in some category, in particular in the category of types.*

Definition 2. *The functor* $\mathsf{eq} : \mathsf{Type} \to \mathsf{Setoid}$ *is defined as the left adjoint to the forgetful functor* $U : \mathsf{Setoid} \to \mathsf{Type}$*. Explicitly, the functor* eq *sends any type* X *to the setoid* $(X, =_X)$ *given by the type* X *itself, equipped with the propositional equality relation* $=_X$ *specified via Martin-Löf's identity type on* X.

Remark 3 (Notation for product). We denote the category-theoretic binary product of objects A and B of a category $\mathcal{C}$ by $A \times B$. We write $\mathsf{pr}_1(A, B) : \mathcal{C}(A \times B, A)$ and $\mathsf{pr}_2(A, B) : \mathcal{C}(A \times B, B)$ for the projections, occasionally omitting the argument (A, B). Given $f : \mathcal{C}(A, B)$ and $g : \mathcal{C}(A, C)$, we write $\langle f, g \rangle : \mathcal{C}(A, B \times C)$ for the induced map into the product such that $\mathsf{pr}_1 \circ \langle f, g \rangle = f$ and $\mathsf{pr}_2 \circ \langle f, g \rangle = g$.

Both of the categories of Definition 1 have binary products; they are *cartesian monoidal*, i.e. the terminal object is neutral with respect to the product. Functors preserving the monoidal structure up to isomorphism are called *strong monoidal*:

Definition 4. *A functor* $F : \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{D}$ *between cartesian monoidal categories is* ***strong monoidal*** *if, for any two objects* A *and* B *of* $\mathcal{C}$*, the morphism*

$$\phi^F_{A,B} := \big\langle F(\mathsf{pr}_1), F(\mathsf{pr}_2) \big\rangle : \mathcal{D}\big(F(A \times B), FA \times FB\big)$$

is an isomorphism. (Note that for cartesian *monoidal categories, the family* ϕ *of morphisms automatically is compatible with the unitators and associators of the source and target categories, since it is given by a universal property.)*

Example 5. The functor $\mathsf{eq} : \mathsf{Type} \to \mathsf{Setoid}$ of Definition 2 is strong monoidal.

$$\frac{t : \mathsf{Stream} A}{\mathsf{head}_A\ t : A} \qquad \frac{t : \mathsf{Stream} A}{\mathsf{tail}_A\ t : \mathsf{Stream} A} \qquad \frac{t \sim t'}{\mathsf{head}\ t = \mathsf{head}\ t'} \qquad \frac{t \sim t'}{\mathsf{tail}\ t \sim \mathsf{tail}\ t'}$$

Fig. 1. Destructors and bisimilarity for the coinductive family Stream

3 Codata types in intensional Martin-Löf type theory

We consider two particular coinductive type families in Intensional Martin-Löf type theory (IMLTT) [19], a type-theoretic foundational system. For $a, b : A$, we denote by $a = b$ the Martin-Löf identity type between a and b.

In this section, we present these types, and we also define *bisimilarity* for each codata type. Bisimilarity is a coinductively defined equivalence relation on types which is considered as the appropriate notion of sameness on inhabitants of these types [12,10]. A coinductive type with bisimilarity hence forms a setoid as in Definition 1. We thus denote bisimilar elements using an infix $\sim$, as in $t \sim t'$.

Maps into a coinductive data type are specified by the observations, i.e. the value of the destructors, on the output of those maps. The precise rule for specifying maps into the considered coinductive type is given in the respective appendix. In this text, we use a more convenient syntax, as illustrated in Equation (3.1).

The first example is the type of *streams* of elements of a given base type A. The precise set of rules specifying that type is given in Appendix A. In the presentation we use the notational convention of Definition 1, using the same name for a setoid and its underlying type.

Example 6. Let A be a type. The type $\mathsf{Stream} A$ of *streams over* A is coinductively defined via the destructors given in Figure 1.

We define a *co*substition operation $\mathsf{cosubst}_{A,B} : (\mathsf{Stream} A \to B) \to \mathsf{Stream} A \to \mathsf{Stream} B$ on streams via the following clauses:

$$\mathsf{head} \circ \mathsf{cosubst}\ f := f \quad \text{and} \quad \mathsf{tail} \circ \mathsf{cosubst}\ f := \mathsf{cosubst}\ f \circ \mathsf{tail}\ . \tag{3.1}$$

We call such an operation "cosubstitution" since its type is dual to, e.g., the simultaneous substitution operation of the lambda calculus [8].

Streams are node-labeled trees where every node has exactly one subtree. We also consider a type of trees where every node has an arbitrary, but fixed, number of subtrees, parametrized by a type B.

Example 7 (Node-labeled trees). We denote by $\mathsf{Tree}_B(A)$ the codata type given by one destructor head and a family of destructors $(\mathsf{tail}_b)_{b:B}$ with types analogous to those defining Stream of Example 6. We thus obtain Stream by considering, for B, the singleton type.

Another codata type we consider models *infinite triangular matrices*. It is more sophisticated than the type of streams as one of its destructors is *heterogeneous*:

Example 8. This codata type is studied in detail by [20]. We give a brief summary, but urge the reader to consult the given reference for an in-depth explanation.



Fig. 2. An infinite triangular matrix over type A and various operations

$$\frac{t : \mathsf{Tri}\ A}{\mathsf{top}_A\ t : A} \qquad \frac{t : \mathsf{Tri}\ A}{\mathsf{rest}_A\ t : \mathsf{Tri}(E \times A)} \qquad \frac{t \sim t'}{\mathsf{top}\ t = \mathsf{top}\ t'} \qquad \frac{t \sim t'}{\mathsf{rest}\ t \sim \mathsf{rest}\ t'}$$

Fig. 3. Destructors and bisimilarity for the coinductive family Tri

The codata type family Tri of infinite triangular matrices is parametrized by a fixed type E for entries not on the diagonal, and indexed by another, *variable*, type A for entries on the diagonal. Schematically, such a matrix looks like in Figure 2.

It is specified via two destructors top and rest, whose types are given in Figure 3. Given a matrix over type A, its rest—obtained by removing the first element on the diagonal, i.e. the top element—can be considered as a trapezium as indicated by the green line in Figure 2, or alternatively, as a triangular matrix over type $E \times A$, by bundling the entries of the diagonal with those above as indicated by the orange frames in Figure 2. The latter representation is reflected in the type of the destructor rest.

Bisimilarity on the inhabitants of that type is defined via the destructors of Figure 3. As with streams, we denote by $\mathsf{Tri}A$ not only the resulting *setoid* of triangular matrices over A, but also its underlying *type*.

A cosubstitution operation, "redecoration", $\mathsf{redec}_{A,B} : (\mathsf{Tri}A \to B) \to \mathsf{Tri}A \to \mathsf{Tri}B$ is defined through the clauses

$$\mathsf{top} \circ \mathsf{redec}\ f := f \quad \text{and} \quad \mathsf{rest} \circ \mathsf{redec}\ f := \mathsf{redec}\ (\mathsf{extend}\ f) \circ \mathsf{rest}\ . \tag{3.2}$$

Here, the family of functions $\mathsf{extend}_{A,B} : (\mathsf{Tri}A \to B) \to \mathsf{Tri}(E \times A) \to E \times B$ is suitably defined to account for the change of the type of the argument of redec when redecorating $\mathsf{rest}\ t : \mathsf{Tri}(E \times A)$ rather than $t : \mathsf{Tri}A$, namely

$$\mathsf{extend}(f) := \langle \mathsf{pr}_1(E, A) \circ \mathsf{top}_{E \times A}, f \circ \mathsf{cut}_A \rangle\ .$$

The auxiliary function $\mathsf{cut}_A : \mathsf{Tri}(E \times A) \to \mathsf{Tri}A$ is defined corecursively via

$$\mathsf{top} \circ \mathsf{cut} := \mathsf{pr}_2 \circ \mathsf{top} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathsf{rest} \circ \mathsf{cut} := \mathsf{cut} \circ \mathsf{rest}\ .$$

All the operations are suitably compatible with the bisimilarity relations, so that they can be equipped with the types

$$\begin{aligned}\mathsf{redec}_{A,B} &: \mathsf{Setoid}(\mathsf{Tri}A, \mathsf{eq}B) \to \mathsf{Setoid}(\mathsf{Tri}A, \mathsf{Tri}B)\\ \mathsf{extend}_{A,B} &: \mathsf{Setoid}(\mathsf{Tri}A, \mathsf{eq}B) \to \mathsf{Setoid}\big(\mathsf{Tri}(E \times A), \mathsf{eq}(E \times B)\big)\\ \mathsf{cut}_A &: \mathsf{Setoid}(\mathsf{Tri}(E \times A), \mathsf{Tri}A)\ .\end{aligned}$$

Note how heterogeneity of the destructor rest makes the definition of redec considerably more complicated than that of the analogous operation $\mathsf{cosubst}$ on streams.

4 Relative comonads and their morphisms

In this section we define the category of *comonads relative to a fixed functor*, and present some examples of such comonads and their morphisms.

Relative monads were defined by [7] as a notion of monad-like structure whose underlying functor is not necessarily an endofunctor. The dual notion is that of a relative *co*monad:

Definition 9. *Let $F : \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{D}$ be a functor. A **relative comonad** T **over** F is given by*

- *a map $T : \mathcal{C}_0 \to \mathcal{D}_0$ on the objects of the categories involved;*
- *an operation $\mathsf{counit} : \forall A : \mathcal{C}_0, \mathcal{D}(TA, FA)$;*
- *an operation $\mathsf{cobind} : \forall A, B : \mathcal{C}_0, \mathcal{D}(TA, FB) \to \mathcal{D}(TA, TB)$ such that*
- $\forall A, B : \mathcal{C}_0, \forall f : \mathcal{D}(TA, FB), \mathsf{counit}_B \circ \mathsf{cobind}(f) = f$;
- $\forall A : \mathcal{C}_0, \mathsf{cobind}(\mathsf{counit}_A) = \mathsf{id}_{TA}$;
- $\forall A, B, C : \mathcal{C}_0, \forall f : \mathcal{D}(TA, FB), \forall g : \mathcal{D}(TB, FC)$, $\mathsf{cobind}(g) \circ \mathsf{cobind}(f) = \mathsf{cobind}(g \circ \mathsf{cobind}(f))$.

Just like relative monads, relative comonads are functorial:

Definition 10. *Let T be a comonad relative to $F : \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{D}$. For $f : \mathcal{C}(A, B)$ we define $\mathsf{lift}^T(f) := \mathsf{cobind}(Ff \circ \mathsf{counit}_A) : \mathcal{D}(TA, TB)$. The functor properties are easily checked.*

Relative comonads over the identity functor are exactly comonads.

Example 11 (Relative comonads from comonads). Let $F : \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{D}$ be a fully faithful functor and $(M, \mathsf{counit}, \mathsf{cobind})$ be a (traditional) comonad (in Kleisli form) on $\mathcal{C}$. We define a comonad FM relative to F by setting:

- $FM(A) := F(MA)$;
- $\mathsf{counit}^{FM}_A := F(\mathsf{counit}^M_A) : \mathcal{D}(FMA, FA)$;
- $\mathsf{cobind}^{FM}_{A,B}(f) := F\big(\mathsf{cobind}^M_{A,B}(F^{-1}f)\big)$.

The proof of the axioms of a relative comonad is immediate.

Example 12 (Streams). The codata type family $\mathsf{Stream} : \mathsf{Type} \to \mathsf{Setoid}$ of Example 6 is equipped with a structure of a comonad relative to the functor $\mathsf{eq} : \mathsf{Type} \to \mathsf{Setoid}$ with $\mathsf{counit}_A := \mathsf{head}_A$ and $\mathsf{cobind}_{A,B} := \mathsf{cosubst}_{A,B}$.

Example 13 (Trees). Fix a type B. Analogously to Example 12, the map $A \mapsto \mathsf{Tree}_B(A)$ of Example 7 is equipped with a structure of a comonad relative to $\mathsf{eq} : \mathsf{Type} \to \mathsf{Setoid}$.

Example 14 (Infinite triangular matrices). The codata type family $\mathsf{Tri} : \mathsf{Type} \to \mathsf{Setoid}$ of Example 8 is equipped with a structure of a comonad relative to the functor $\mathsf{eq} : \mathsf{Type} \to \mathsf{Setoid}$ with $\mathsf{counit}_A := \mathsf{top}_A$ and $\mathsf{cobind}_{A,B} := \mathsf{redec}_{A,B}$.

Remark 15. A *weak constructive comonad* as defined by [20] to characterize the codata type Tri and redecoration on it, is *precisely* a comonad relative to the functor $\mathsf{eq} : \mathsf{Type} \to \mathsf{Setoid}$.

The notion of relative comonad captures many properties of Stream resp. Tri and cosubstitution on them, in particular the interplay of cosubstitution with the destructors head resp. top via the first two axioms. In order to capture the interplay of cosubstitution with the destructor tail resp. rest, we develop the notion of *comodule over a relative comonad* in Section 5.

Morphisms of relative comonads are natural transformations that are compatible with the comonadic structure:

Definition 16. *Let T and S be comonads relative to a functor $F : \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{D}$. A **morphism of relative comonads** $\tau : T \to S$ is given by a family of morphisms $\tau_A : \mathcal{D}(TA, SA)$ such that for any $A : \mathcal{C}_0$, $\mathsf{counit}^T_A = \mathsf{counit}^S_A \circ \tau_A$ and for any $A, B : \mathcal{C}_0$ and $f : \mathcal{D}(SA, FB)$, $\tau_B \circ \mathsf{cobind}^T(f \circ \tau_A) = \mathsf{cobind}^S(f) \circ \tau_A$.*

Relative comonads over a fixed functor F and their morphisms form a category $\mathsf{RComonad}(F)$ with the obvious identity and composition operations.

Remark 17. A morphism $\tau : T \to S$ of relative comonads over a functor $F : \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{D}$ is *natural* with respect to the functorial action of Definition 10.

Example 18. Continuing Example 11 with M, M' two monads on $\mathcal{C}$, given a comonad morphism $\tau : M \to M'$, one obtains a morphism of relative comonads $F\tau : FM \to FM'$ by setting $F\tau_A := F(\tau_A)$. Again, the axioms are easy to check.

Remark 19. The definitions given in Example 11 and Example 18 yield a functor from comonads on $\mathcal{C}$ to comonads relative to $F : \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{D}$. If F is a right adjoint with left adjoint L, $L \dashv F$, then postcomposing a comonad T relative to F with the functor L yields a monad on $\mathcal{C}$. Again, this map extends to morphisms. The two functors between categories of monads thus defined are again adjoints. Writing down the details is lengthy but easy.

For instance, in a type theory with quotients, such as the *Univalent Foundations* a.k.a. *Homotopy Type Theory* [24], the functor "quotient" from setoids to types is left adjoint to the fully faithful functor $\mathsf{eq} : \mathsf{Type} \to \mathsf{Setoid}$, thus above construction is applicable.

Example 20. We define a morphism of relative comonads $\mathsf{diag} : \mathsf{Tri} \to \mathsf{Stream}$: Given a matrix $t : \mathsf{Tri}A$, its diagonal is a stream $\mathsf{diag}_A\ t : \mathsf{Stream}A$. The map diag_A is defined via the clauses

$$\mathsf{head} \circ \mathsf{diag}_A := \mathsf{top} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathsf{tail} \circ \mathsf{diag}_A := \mathsf{diag}_A \circ \mathsf{cut} \circ \mathsf{rest}\ .$$

Remark 21. The destructors tail (for Stream) and rest (for Tri) are *not* comonad morphisms. One can, however, equip the functor given by precomposing Tri with "product with E", i.e. $A \mapsto \mathsf{Tri}(E \times A)$, with a structure of relative comonad, induced by that on Tri, cf. Definition 22.

Definition 22. *Let T be a comonad relative to a strong monoidal functor $F : \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{D}$ between cartesian monoidal categories, and let $E : \mathcal{C}_0$ be a fixed object of $\mathcal{C}$. The map $A \mapsto T(E \times A)$ inherits the structure of a comonad relative to F from T: the counit is defined as*

$$\mathsf{counit}_A := \mathsf{counit}^T_A \circ \mathsf{lift}^T(\mathsf{pr}_2(E, A))$$

and the cobind operation as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathsf{cobind}_{A,B} : \mathcal{D}\big(T(E \times A), FB\big) &\to \mathcal{D}\big(T(E \times A), T(E \times B)\big) \\ f &\mapsto \mathsf{cobind}^T(\mathsf{extend}'\ f) \end{aligned}$$

with extend' *defined as*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathsf{extend}' : \mathcal{D}\big(T(E \times A), FB\big) &\to \mathcal{D}\big(T(E \times A), F(E \times B)\big)\ , \\ f &\mapsto {\phi^F_{E,B}}^{-1} \circ \langle \mathsf{counit}^T_E \circ T(\mathsf{pr}_1), f \rangle\ . \end{aligned}$$

5 Comodules over relative comonads

In this section we develop the notion of *comodule over a relative comonad*, dualizing the notion of module over a relative monad [4].

Definition 23. *Let T be a comonad relative to $F : \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{D}$, and let $\mathcal{E}$ be a category. A* ***comodule over T towards $\mathcal{E}$*** *consists of*

- *a map $M : \mathcal{C}_0 \to \mathcal{E}_0$ on the objects of the categories involved and*
- *an operation $\mathsf{mcobind} : \forall A, B : \mathcal{C}_0, \mathcal{D}(TA, FB) \to \mathcal{E}(MA, MB)$ such that*
- $\forall A : \mathcal{C}_0, \mathsf{mcobind}(\mathsf{counit}_A) = \mathsf{id}_{MA}$*;*
- $\forall A, B, C : \mathcal{C}_0, \forall f : \mathcal{D}(TA, FB), \forall g : \mathcal{D}(TB, FC)$,
  $\mathsf{mcobind}(g) \circ \mathsf{mcobind}(f) = \mathsf{mcobind}(g \circ \mathsf{cobind}(f))$.

Every relative comonad comes with a canonical comodule over itself:

Definition 24. *Given a comonad T relative to $F : \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{D}$, the map $A \mapsto TA$ yields a comodule over T with target category $\mathcal{D}$, the* ***tautological comodule*** *of T, also called T. The comodule operation is given by $\mathsf{mcobind}^T(f) := \mathsf{cobind}^T(f)$.*

Similarly to relative comonads, comodules over these are functorial:

Definition 25. *Let $M : \mathsf{RComod}(T, \mathcal{E})$ be a comodule over T towards some category $\mathcal{E}$. For $f : \mathcal{C}(A, B)$ we define*

$$\mathsf{mlift}^M(f) := \mathsf{mcobind}(Ff \circ \mathsf{counit}_A).$$

A more interesting example of comodule is given by the functor that maps a type A to the setoid $\mathsf{Tri}(E \times A)$ for some fixed type E:

Example 26. The map $A \mapsto \mathsf{Tri}(E \times A)$ is equipped with a comodule structure over the relative comonad Tri by defining the comodule operation $\mathsf{mcobind}$ as (cf. Example 8) $\mathsf{mcobind}_{A,B}(f) := \mathsf{redec}(\mathsf{extend}\ f)$.

A *morphism of comodules* is given by a family of morphisms that is compatible with the comodule operation:

Definition 27. *Let $M, N : \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{E}$ be comodules over the comonad T relative to $F : \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{D}$. A **morphism of comodules** from M to N is given by a family of morphisms $\alpha_A : \mathcal{E}(MA, NA)$ such that for any $A, B : \mathcal{C}_0$ and $f : \mathcal{D}(TA, FB)$ one has $\alpha_B \circ \mathsf{mcobind}^M(f) = \mathsf{mcobind}^N(f) \circ \alpha_A$.*

Example 28. The destructor $\mathsf{tail}_A : \mathsf{Stream}A \to \mathsf{Stream}A$ is the carrier of a morphism of tautological comodules (over the relative comonad Stream).

Example 29. The destructor rest of Example 8 is a morphism of comodules over the comonad Tri from the tautological comodule Tri to the comodule $\mathsf{Tri}(E \times _)$.

Composition and identity of comodule morphisms happens pointwise. We thus obtain a category $\mathsf{RComod}(T, \mathcal{E})$ of comodules over a fixed comonad T, towards a fixed target category $\mathcal{E}$.

Remark 30. The family of morphisms constituting a comodule morphism is actually natural with respect to the functoriality defined in Definition 25.

Given a morphism of comonads, we can "transport" comodules over the source comonad to comodules over the target comonad:

Definition 31. *Let $\tau : T \to S$ be a morphism of comonads relative to a functor $F : \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{D}$, and let furthermore M be a comodule over T towards a category $\mathcal{E}$. We define the **pushforward comodule** $\tau_* M$ to be the comodule over S given by $\tau_* M(A) := MA$ and, for $f : \mathcal{D}(SA, FB)$,*

$$\mathsf{mcobind}^{\tau_* M}(f) := \mathsf{mcobind}^M(f \circ \tau_A) : \mathcal{E}(MA, MB)\ .$$

Pushforward is functorial: if M and N are comodules over T with codomain category $\mathcal{E}$, and $\alpha : M \to N$ is a morphism of comodules, then we define $\tau_*\alpha : \tau_* M \to \tau_* N$ as the family of morphisms $(\tau_*\alpha)_A := \alpha_A$. It is easy to check that this is a morphism of comodules (over S) between $\tau_* M$ and $\tau_* N$. Pushforward thus yields a functor $\tau_* : \mathsf{RComod}(T, \mathcal{E}) \to \mathsf{RComod}(S, \mathcal{E})$.

As presented in Definition 24, every relative comonad induces a comodule over itself. This extends to morphisms of relative comonads:

Definition 32. *Let $\tau : T \to S$ be a morphism of comonads relative to a functor $F : \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{D}$. Then τ gives rise to a morphism of comodules over S from the pushforward of the tautological comodule of T along τ to the tautological comodule over S,*

$$\langle\tau\rangle : \tau_* T \to S \ , \quad \langle\tau\rangle_A := \tau_A \ .$$

6 Terminality for streams and infinite triangular matrices

In this section, we define a notion of "coalgebra" for the signatures of streams and triangular matrices, respectively. We then show that the codata types Stream and Tri constitute the terminal object in the respective category of coalgebras. We put "coalgebra" in quotes for the reason that our coalgebras are not defined as coalgebras for a monad or an endofunctor.

The terminal coalgebra result is hardly surprising; however, it is still interesting as it characterizes not only the codata types themselves, but also the respective bisimilarity relations and comonadic operations on them, via a universal property.

6.1 Coalgebras for Stream

We first consider the homogeneous codata type of streams.

Definition 33. *A **coalgebra for** Stream is given by a pair (S, t) consisting of*

- *a comonad S relative to $\mathsf{eq} : \mathsf{Type} \to \mathsf{Setoid}$ and*
- *a morphism t of tautological comodules over S, $t : S \to S$.*

A coalgebra morphism $(S, t) \to (S', t')$ is given by a comonad morphism $\tau : S \to S'$ such that $\langle\tau\rangle \circ \tau_* t = t' \circ \langle\tau\rangle$.

This defines a category, with the obvious composition and identity.

Theorem 34. *The pair $(\mathsf{Stream}, \mathsf{tail})$ is the terminal coalgebra in the category of coalgebras of Definition 33.*

More precisely, the aforementioned theorem says that the rules given in Appendix A allow to prove that the category of coalgebras defined in Definition 33 has a terminal object.

Example 35. We equip the relative comonad Tri with the structure of a coalgebra for Stream by defining a morphism of tautological comodules over Tri, given by $t^{\mathsf{diag}} := \mathsf{cut} \circ \mathsf{rest} : \mathsf{Tri} \to \mathsf{Tri}$. The resulting terminal coalgebra morphism $(\mathsf{Tri}, t^{\mathsf{diag}}) \to (\mathsf{Stream}, \mathsf{tail})$ has as underlying morphism of relative comonads the one defined in Example 20.

Remark 36. Fix a type B. A result analogous to Theorem 34 holds for trees Tree_B of Example 13. We refrain from giving a precise statement of this result.

6.2 Coalgebras for Tri

In analogy to the definition of coalgebras for the signature of streams, one would define a coalgebra for the signature of Tri as a pair (T, r) of a comonad T relative to $\mathsf{eq} : \mathsf{Type} \to \mathsf{Setoid}$ and a morphism of comodules $r : T \to T(E \times _)$. It turns out that in this way, one is not capable of obtaining the right auxiliary function cut for what is supposed to be the *terminal* such coalgebra (where cut is used to define the comodule $\mathsf{Tri}(E \times _)$), namely the pair $(\mathsf{Tri}, \mathsf{rest})$. As a remedy, we define a coalgebra to come equipped with a specified operation analogous to cut, and some laws governing the behavior of that operation:

Definition 37. *Let $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{D}$ be categories with binary products and $F : \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{D}$ a strong monoidal functor. Let $E : \mathcal{C}_0$ be a fixed object of $\mathcal{C}$. We define a* ***comonad relative to F with cut relative to E*** *to be a comonad T relative to F together with a cut operation*

$$\mathsf{cut} : \forall\ A : \mathcal{C}_0, T(E \times A) \to TA \qquad \textit{such that}$$

- $\forall\ A : C_0, \mathsf{counit}_A \circ \mathsf{cut}_A = \mathsf{counit}_A \circ \mathsf{lift}^T(\mathsf{pr}_2(E, A))$;
- $\forall\ A\ B : C_0, \forall\ f : \mathcal{D}(TA, FB), \mathsf{cobind}(f) \circ \mathsf{cut}_A = \mathsf{cut}_B \circ \mathsf{cobind}(\mathsf{extend}\ f)$,

where, for $f : \mathcal{D}(TA, FB)$, we define $\mathsf{extend}(f) : \mathcal{D}\big(T(E \times A), F(E \times B)\big)$ as

$$\mathsf{extend}(f) := {\phi^F_{E,B}}^{-1} \circ (\mathsf{counit}_E \times f) \circ \langle T(\mathsf{pr}_1), \mathsf{cut} \rangle \ .$$

Morphisms of comonads with cut are morphisms of comonads that are compatible with the respective cut operations:

Definition 38. *Let (T, cut^T) and (S, cut^S) be two comonads relative to a functor F with cut relative to E as in Definition 37. A* ***morphism of comonads with cut*** *is a comonad morphism τ between the underlying comonads as in Definition 16 that commutes suitably with the respective cut operations, i.e. for any $A : \mathcal{C}_0$, $\mathsf{cut}^S_A \circ \tau_{E \times A} = \tau_A \circ \mathsf{cut}^T_A$.*

Comonads with cut relative to a fixed functor $F : \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{D}$ and $E : \mathcal{C}_0$ form a category $\mathsf{RComonadwCut}(F, E)$. There is the obvious forgetful functor from $\mathsf{RComonadwCut}(F, E)$ to $\mathsf{RComonad}(F)$. Conversely, any comonad T relative to a suitable functor can be equipped with a cut operation, using functoriality of T.

Remark 39 (Canonical cut operation). Any comonad T relative to a strong monoidal functor $F : \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{D}$ can be equipped with a cut operation relative to $E : \mathcal{C}_0$ satisfying the properties of Definition 37 by setting

$$\mathsf{ccut}_A := \mathsf{cut}_A := \mathsf{lift}^T\big(\mathsf{pr}_2(E, A)\big) \ .$$

(The extra "c" of ccut stands for "canonical".) It follows from the axioms of comonad morphism that a comonad morphism $\tau : T \to S$ satisfies the equation of Definition 38 for the thus defined operations ccut^T and ccut^S, hence constitutes

a morphism of comonads with cut from (T, ccut^T) to (S, ccut^S). We thus obtain a functor

$$\mathsf{ccut}_{F,E} : \mathsf{RComonad}(F) \to \mathsf{RComonadwCut}(F, E)$$

from relative comonads over F to relative comonads over F with cut relative to a fixed object $E : \mathcal{C}_0$ given on objects by $T \mapsto (T, \mathsf{ccut}^T)$.

The functor $\mathsf{ccut}_{F,E}$, followed by the forgetful functor, yields the identity. We can thus view relative comonads with cut as a generalization of relative comonads.

Our prime example of relative comonad comes with a cut operation that is *not* the canonical one:

Example 40. The relative comonad Tri from Example 14, together with the cut operation defined in Example 8, is a comonad with cut as in Definition 37.

Given a comodule M over a relative comonad T with cut, we define a comodule over T obtained by precomposition of M with "product with a fixed object E":

Definition 41. *Suppose $F : \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{D}$ is a strong monoidal functor, and T is a comonad relative to F with a cut operation relative to $E : \mathcal{C}_0$ as in Definition 37. Given a comodule M over T, **precomposition with "product** with E" gives a comodule $M(E \times _) : A \mapsto M(E \times A)$ over T. The comodule operation is deduced from that of M by*

$$\mathsf{mcobind}^{M(E\times_)}_{A,B} : \mathcal{D}(TA, FB) \to \mathcal{E}\big(M(E \times A), M(E \times B)\big) \ ,$$
$$f \mapsto \mathsf{mcobind}^{M}_{E\times A, E\times B}(\mathsf{extend}(f)) \ ,$$

where the extend operation is the one defined in Definition 37.

Furthermore, given two comodules M and N over $\mathcal{T}$ with target category $\mathcal{E}$, and a comodule morphism $\alpha : M \to N$, the assignment $\alpha(E \times _)_A := \alpha_{E\times A}$ defines a comodule morphism $\alpha(E \times _) : M(E \times _) \to N(E \times _)$.
We thus obtain an endofunctor on the category of comodules over T towards $\mathcal{E}$, $M \mapsto M(E \times _) : \mathsf{RComod}(T, \mathcal{E}) \to \mathsf{RComod}(T, \mathcal{E})$.

Remark 42 (Pushforward commutes with product in context). Note that the constructions of Definition 41 and Definition 31 commute: we have an isomorphism of comodules $\tau_*(M(E \times _)) \cong (\tau_* M)(E \times _)$ given pointwise by identity morphisms.

It directly follows from the definition that the cut operation of any comonad T with cut constitutes a comodule morphism $\mathsf{cut} : T(E \times _) \to T$. We can thus restate the definition of a morphism of comonads with cut as in Definition 38 by asking the following diagram of comodule morphisms (in the category $\mathsf{RComod}(S, \mathcal{D})$) to commute (where in the upper left corner we silently add an isomorphism as in Remark 42):

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \tau_* T(E \times _) & \xrightarrow{\tau_*(\mathsf{cut}^T)} & \tau_* T \\ {\scriptstyle \langle\tau\rangle(E\times_)}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \langle\tau\rangle} \\ S(E \times _) & \xrightarrow[\mathsf{cut}^S]{} & S \ . \end{array}$$

The construction of Definition 41 yields a categorical characterization of the rest destructor—more precisely, of its behavior with respect to cosubstitution as in Equation (3.2)—via the notion of comodule morphism:

Example 43. This example is a reformulation of Example 29. Consider the comonad Tri, equipped with the cut operation of Example 40. The destructor rest of Example 8 is a morphism of comodules over the comonad Tri from the tautological comodule Tri to $\mathsf{Tri}(E \times _)$.

Definition 44. *Let $E : \mathsf{Type}_0$ be a set. Let $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T}_E$ be the category of* ***coalgebras for infinite triangular matrices*** *where an object consists of*

- *a comonad T over the functor $\mathsf{eq} : \mathsf{Type} \to \mathsf{Setoid}$ with cut relative to E and*
- *a morphism rest of comodules over T of type $T \to T(E \times _)$*

such that for any set A, $\mathsf{rest}_A \circ \mathsf{cut}_A = \mathsf{cut}_{E\times A} \circ \mathsf{rest}_{E\times A}$.

The last equation can be stated as an equality of comodule morphisms as

$$\mathsf{rest} \circ \mathsf{cut} = \mathsf{cut}(E \times _) \circ \mathsf{rest}(E \times _) \quad \big(= (\mathsf{cut} \circ \mathsf{rest})(E \times _)\big) \ .$$

A morphism between two such objects (T, rest^T) and (S, rest^S) is given by a morphism of relative comonads with cut $\tau : T \to S$ such that the following diagram of comodule morphisms in the category $\mathsf{RComod}(S, \mathcal{E})$ commutes,

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \tau_* T & \xrightarrow{\tau_*(\mathsf{rest}^T)} & \tau_* T(E \times _) \\ {\scriptstyle \langle\tau\rangle}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \langle\tau\rangle(E\times_)} \\ S & \xrightarrow[\mathsf{rest}^S]{} & S(E \times _) \ . \end{array}$$

Here in the upper right corner we silently insert an isomorphism as in Remark 42.

Theorem 45. *The pair $(\mathsf{Tri}, \mathsf{rest})$ consisting of the relative comonad with cut Tri of Example 40 together with the morphism of comodules rest of Example 29, constitutes the terminal coalgebra of triangular matrices.*

Proof (sketch). For a given coalgebra (T, rest^T), the (terminal) morphism $\bigcirc = \bigcirc_T : T \to \mathsf{Tri}$ is defined via the corecursive equations

$$\mathsf{top}\big(\bigcirc\ t\big) := \mathsf{counit}^T\ t \quad \text{and} \tag{6.1}$$

$$\mathsf{rest}\big(\bigcirc\ t\big) := \bigcirc(\mathsf{rest}^T\ t) \ . \tag{6.2}$$

By coinduction we show that the map $\bigcirc$ is compatible with cobind and cut operations of the source and target coalgebras. We omit these calculations, which can be consulted in the Coq source files.

Note that there is actually no choice in this definition: Equation (6.1) is forced upon us since we want $\bigcirc$ to constitute a morphism of comonads—the equation directly corresponds to one of the axioms. Equation (6.2) is forced upon us by the diagram a morphism of coalgebras has to make commute.

The same argument is used to show, again by coinduction, that any two morphisms of coalgebras $\tau, \rho : (T, \mathsf{rest}^T) \to (\mathsf{Tri}, \mathsf{rest})$ are equal, thus concluding the proof.

This universal property of terminality characterizes not only the codata type of infinite triangular matrices, but also the **bisimilarity** relation on it as well as the **redecoration** operation.

7 Formalization in `Coq`

All our definitions and theorems are mechanized in the proof assistant `Coq` [11]. The formalization of infinite triangular matrices is taken from the work by [20], and only slightly adapted to compile with the version of `Coq` we use. The mechanization does *not* rely on any additional axioms. The `Coq` source files and HTML documentation are available from the project web site [6].

In the following we explain some of our design choices for this mechanization and point out differences between the pen-and-paper definitions and the mechanized ones.

7.1 Implementation choices

We explain two choices we made in the course of the formalization in `Coq`. The first choice concerns the formalization of categories, more precisely, how to formalize *equality of morphisms*. The second choice concerns the formalization of algebraic structures.

Setoids for hom-sets We formalize categories to be given by a type of objects and a dependent type—indexed by pairs of objects—of morphisms, equipped with suitable composition and identity operations satisfying appropriate axioms. More precisely, the family of morphisms is given by a family of *setoids*, where the setoidal equivalence relation on each type of morphisms denotes the equality relation on these morphisms. This approach was first used by [3] in the proof assistant `LEGO`, and also by [17] in their library of category theory in `Coq`. At the moment, it seems to be the standard way of formalizing categories in intensional Martin-Löf type theory. Alternatively, we could have chosen to consider morphisms modulo propositional equality, which is feasible in a more extensional type theory [5].

Indeed, the morphisms we consider—morphisms of comonads and comodules—are given by structures bundling a lot of data and properties; in order to consider two such morphisms as equal, we usually only compare one field of the corresponding records. Furthermore, this field usually consists of a (dependent) function. It would be rather cumbersome to reduce equality of two such records to extensional equality of one of their fields, necessitating the use of the axioms of propositional and functional extensionality in IMLTT. Using setoids for morphisms instead seems to come with less overhead and to be conceptually cleaner.

Records vs. classes Two approaches to the formalization of mathematical structures have been used extensively in Coq: on the one hand, packaging structures in *record types* in combination with use of *canonical structures*, is used with success, e.g., in the formalization of algebraic structure in the context of the proof of the Feit-Thompson theorem [15]. On the other hand, [22] suggest the use of *type classes*, in particular when multiple inheritance is an issue.

In the present formalization, we decide to use records rather than classes, since the strongest argument for type classes—multiple inheritance—does not occur. We make use of canonical structures in order for Coq to deduce instances of categories when we mention objects of a category; in particular, this is used to allow for overloading of the notation for morphisms of a category. We can thus conveniently use the same arrow symbol to denote the type of morphisms between two comonads, between two comodules and so on.

7.2 Formal vs. informal definitions

In the Coq formalization, we provide two different versions of the terminal semantics results:

In one version, we use the CoInductive vernacular command of Coq to define the codata types we consider. In this way, coinductive types are specified through **constructors** rather than **destructors**. The definition of functions into coinductive data types thus specified hence looks very different to function definitions in terms of destructors as used in the present article.

In the other version we do not use that device for specifying coinductive types in Coq, but augment Coq by the axioms given in Appendix A and Appendix B, respectively, and prove the existence of a terminal coalgebra from these axioms. This version thus is in close correspondence with the theory presented in the article.

This might be the right moment to point to work on a device allowing the declaration of coinductive types via destructors in Agda, see [2].

8 Conclusions and future work

We have given a category-theoretic characterization, via a universal property, of streams and of infinite triangular matrices, each equipped with a cosubstitution operation, in intensional Martin-Löf type theory.

The development of a notion of "signature" at least for *homogeneous* codata types, and a terminal semantics for them, in line with the definitions we give for Stream, is easy and will be treated in a forthcoming work.

In a more extensional type theory, such as *Homotopy Type Theory* [24], one can reflect bisimilarity into propositional equality by *quotienting*, thus eliminating the need to work with setoids. This will be investigated in future work.

Furthermore, we will work on a suitable notion of *signature* for the specification of general coinductive data types with a cosubstitution operation.

Finally, we would like to integrate *equations* into the notion of signature, which will allow, e.g., considering branching trees modulo permutation of subtrees.

Acknowledgments We thank André Hirschowitz, Ralph Matthes and Paige North for many helpful discussions.

References

1. Andreas Abel, Ralph Matthes, and Tarmo Uustalu. Iteration and coiteration schemes for higher-order and nested datatypes. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 333(1-2):3–66, 2005.
2. Andreas Abel, Brigitte Pientka, David Thibodeau, and Anton Setzer. Copatterns: programming infinite structures by observations. In Roberto Giacobazzi and Radhia Cousot, editors, *Principles of Programming Languages*, pages 27–38. ACM, 2013.
3. Peter Aczel. Galois: A Theory Development Project. Technical Report for the 1993 Turin meeting on the Representation of Mathematics in Logical Frameworks., 1993.
4. Benedikt Ahrens. Modules over relative monads for syntax and semantics. Accepted for publication in Math. Struct. in Comp. Science.
5. Benedikt Ahrens, Krzysztof Kapulkin, and Michael Shulman. Univalent categories and the Rezk completion. *Math. Struct. in Comp. Science*, to appear.
6. Benedikt Ahrens and Régis Spadotti. Terminal semantics for codata types in intensional Martin-Löf type theory. http://benediktahrens.github.io/coinductives/.
7. Thorsten Altenkirch, James Chapman, and Tarmo Uustalu. Monads need not be endofunctors. In C.-H. Luke Ong, editor, *Foundations of Software Science and Computational Structures*, volume 6014 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 297–311. Springer, 2010.
8. Thorsten Altenkirch and Bernhard Reus. Monadic presentations of lambda terms using generalized inductive types. In *Computer Science Logic, 13th International Workshop*, pages 453–468, 1999.
9. Steven Awodey, Nicola Gambino, and Kristina Sojakova. Inductive types in homotopy type theory. In *LICS*, pages 95–104. IEEE, 2012.
10. Yves Bertot. Coinduction in coq. *CoRR*, abs/cs/0603119, 2006.
11. Coq development team. The Coq Proof Assistant, v8.4pl3, 2013.
12. Thierry Coquand. Infinite objects in type theory. In Henk Barendregt and Tobias Nipkow, editors, *TYPES*, volume 806 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 62–78. Springer, 1993.
13. Peter Dybjer. Representing inductively defined sets by wellorderings in martin-löf's type theory. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 176(1-2):329–335, 1997.
14. Marcelo Fiore, Gordon Plotkin, and Daniele Turi. Abstract syntax and variable binding. In *Proceedings of the 14th Annual IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science*, LICS '99, pages 193–202, Washington, DC, USA, 1999. IEEE Computer Society.
15. François Garillot, Georges Gonthier, Assia Mahboubi, and Laurence Rideau. Packaging mathematical structures. In Stefan Berghofer, Tobias Nipkow, Christian Urban, and Makarius Wenzel, editors, *Theorem Proving in Higher Order Logics*, volume 5674 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 327–342. Springer, 2009.
16. André Hirschowitz and Marco Maggesi. Modules over monads and initial semantics. *Inf. Comput.*, 208(5):545–564, 2010.
17. Gérard Huet and Amokrane Saïbi. Constructive category theory. In *In Proceedings of the Joint CLICS-TYPES Workshop on Categories and Type Theory, Goteborg*. MIT Press, 1998.

18. Bart Jacobs and Jan Rutten. A tutorial on (co) algebras and (co) induction. *Bulletin-European Association for Theoretical Computer Science*, 62:222–259, 1997.
19. Per Martin-Löf. *Intuitionistic Type Theory*. Bibliopolis, 1984.
20. Ralph Matthes and Celia Picard. Verification of redecoration for infinite triangular matrices using coinduction. In Nils Anders Danielsson and Bengt Nordström, editors, *Workshop on Types for Proofs and Programs*, volume 19 of *LIPIcs*, pages 55–69. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2011.
21. Ieke Moerdijk and Erik Palmgren. Wellfounded trees in categories. *Ann. Pure Appl. Logic*, 104(1-3):189–218, 2000.
22. Bas Spitters and Eelis van der Weegen. Type classes for mathematics in type theory. *Mathematical Structures in Computer Science*, 21(4):795–825, 2011.
23. Daniele Turi and Jan J. M. M. Rutten. On the foundations of final coalgebra semantics. *Mathematical Structures in Computer Science*, 8(5):481–540, 1998.
24. The Univalent Foundations Program. *Homotopy Type Theory: Univalent Foundations of Mathematics*. http://homotopytypetheory.org/book, Institute for Advanced Study, 2013.
25. Tarmo Uustalu and Varmo Vene. The dual of substitution is redecoration. In Kevin Hammond and Sharon Curtis, editors, *Scottish Functional Programming Workshop*, volume 3 of *Trends in Functional Programming*, pages 99–110. Intellect, 2001.

A Rules for **Stream** and bisimilarity

A.1 Stream

Formation

$$\frac{A : \mathsf{Type}}{\mathsf{Stream}A : \mathsf{Type}}$$

Destruction

$$\frac{t : \mathsf{Stream}A}{\mathsf{head}_A\ t : A} \qquad \frac{t : \mathsf{Stream}A}{\mathsf{tail}_A\ t : \mathsf{Stream}A}$$

Creation

$$\frac{T : \mathsf{Type} \qquad hd : T \to A \qquad tl : T \to T}{\mathsf{corec}_A\ hd\ tl : T \to \mathsf{Stream}A}$$

Computation

$$\frac{hd : T \to A \qquad tl : T \to T \qquad t : T}{\mathsf{head}_A(\mathsf{corec}_A\ hd\ tl\ t) = hd(t)}$$

$$\frac{hd : T \to A \qquad tl : T \to T \qquad t : T}{\mathsf{tail}_A(\mathsf{corec}_A\ hd\ tl\ t) = \mathsf{corec}_A\ hd\ tl\ (tl\ t)}$$

A.2 Bisimilarity

Formation

$$\frac{A : \mathsf{Type} \qquad s, t : \mathsf{Stream} A}{\mathsf{bisim}_A\ s\ t : \mathsf{Type}}$$

Destruction

$$\frac{s, t : \mathsf{Stream} A \qquad p : \mathsf{bisim}_A\ s\ t}{\mathsf{head}_A\ s = \mathsf{head}_A\ t} \qquad \frac{s, t : \mathsf{Stream} A \qquad p : \mathsf{bisim}_A\ s\ t}{\mathsf{bisim}_A(\mathsf{tail}_A\ s)(\mathsf{tail}_A\ t)}$$

Creation

$$\frac{\begin{array}{c} R : \mathsf{Stream} A \to \mathsf{Stream} A \to \mathsf{Type} \\ \forall\ s, t : \mathsf{Stream} A, R\ s\ t \to \mathsf{head}\ s = \mathsf{head}\ t \\ \forall\ s, t : \mathsf{Stream} A, R\ s\ t \to \mathsf{bisim}(\mathsf{tail}\ s)(\mathsf{tail}\ t) \end{array}}{\forall\ s, t : \mathsf{Stream} A, R\ s\ t \to \mathsf{bisim}\ s\ t}$$

B Rules for **Tri** and bisimilarity

B.1 Tri

Formation

$$\frac{A : \mathsf{Type}}{\mathsf{Tri} A : \mathsf{Type}}$$

Destruction

$$\frac{t : \mathsf{Tri} A}{\mathsf{top}_A\ t : A} \qquad \frac{t : \mathsf{Tri} A}{\mathsf{rest}_A\ t : \mathsf{Tri}(E \times A)}$$

Creation

$$\frac{T : \mathsf{Type} \to \mathsf{Type} \qquad hd : \forall A, TA \to A \qquad tl : \forall A, TA \to T(E \times A)}{\mathsf{corec}_T\ hd\ tl : \forall A, TA \to \mathsf{Tri} A}$$

Computation

$$\frac{hd : \forall A, TA \to A \qquad tl : \forall A, TA \to T(E \times A) \qquad t : TA}{\mathsf{top}_T(\mathsf{corec}_A\ hd\ tl\ t) = hd(t)}$$

$$\frac{hd : \forall A, TA \to A \qquad tl : \forall A, TA \to T(E \times A) \qquad t : TA}{\mathsf{rest}_T(\mathsf{corec}_A\ hd\ tl\ t) = \mathsf{corec}_A\ hd\ tl\ (tl\ t)}$$

B.2 Bisimilarity

Formation

$$\frac{A : \mathsf{Type} \qquad s, t : \mathsf{Tri}A}{\mathsf{bisim}_A\ s\ t : \mathsf{Type}}$$

Destruction

$$\frac{s, t : \mathsf{Tri}A \qquad p : \mathsf{bisim}_A\ s\ t}{\mathsf{top}_A\ s = \mathsf{top}_A\ t} \qquad \frac{s, t : \mathsf{Tri}A \qquad p : \mathsf{bisim}_A\ s\ t}{\mathsf{bisim}_A(\mathsf{rest}_A\ s)(\mathsf{rest}_A\ t)}$$

Creation

$$\frac{\begin{array}{c} R : \forall A, \mathsf{Tri}A \to \mathsf{Tri}A \to \mathsf{Type} \\ \forall A, \forall\ s, t : \mathsf{Tri}A, R\ s\ t \to \mathsf{top}\ s = \mathsf{top}\ t \\ \forall A, \forall\ s, t : \mathsf{Tri}A, R\ s\ t \to \mathsf{bisim}(\mathsf{tail}\ s)(\mathsf{tail}\ t) \end{array}}{\forall A, \forall\ s, t : \mathsf{Tri}A, R\ s\ t \to \mathsf{bisim}\ s\ t}$$

C Correspondence of informal and formal definitions

All our definitions and theorems are formalized in the proof assistant `Coq`. The `Coq` files and HTML documentation are available from the project web page [6]. For easier orientation, the table below gives the correspondence between the items in this article and their names in the formal development.

Informal	Reference	Formal
Category		`Category`
Functor		`Functor`
Relative comonad	Def. 9	`RelativeComonad`
Triangular matrices as comonad	Ex. 14	`Tri`
Comodule over comonad	Def. 23	`Comodule`
Tautological comodule (of T)	Def. 24	`tcomod`, `<T>`
tail is comodule morphism	Ex. 28	`Tail`
rest is comodule morphism	Ex. 29	`Rest`
Pushforward comodule	Def. 31	`pushforward`
Induced comodule morphism	Def. 32	`induced_morphism`
Coalgebras for streams	Def. 33	`Stream`
Stream is terminal	Thm. 34	`StreamTerminal.Terminality`
Relative comonad with cut	Def. 37	`RelativeComonadWithCut`
Precomposition with product	Def. 41	`precomposition_with_product`
Coalgebras for triangular matrices	Def. 44	`TriMat`
Tri is terminal	Thm. 45	`TriMatTerminal.Terminality`